

CALIFORNIA RURAL COUNTIES TASK FORCE

*CELIA McADAM, CHAIR
PLACER COUNTY TRANS. PLANNING AGENCY
(530) 823-4030*

*DARIN GROSSI, VICE CHAIR
TUOLUMNE CO/CITIES AREA PLAN. COUNCIL
(209) 533-5601*

*WALT ALLEN, SECRETARY
TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR MONTEREY COUNTY
(831) 775-0903*

AGENDA **January 18, 2002** **12:30 pm**

Department of Transportation Building
1120 N Street, Room 2116 (Directors Meeting Room)
Sacramento, CA

12:30 pm	A.	Self Introductions	
12:35 pm	B.	Approval of Minutes from November 16, 2001	W. Allen
12:40 pm	C.	2002 STIP Overview/Schedule a. Draft 2002 ITIP	D. Brewer S. McGowen
12:55 pm	D.	State Only Funding Outlook for 2002 STIP	S. McGowen D. Saxby
1:40 pm	E.	Proposed Revisions to STIP Criteria a. Road Rehabilitation Eligibility b. CSAC Transportation and Public Works Financing Policy and Revenue Principles	P. Dow K. Rosser
2:15 pm		BREAK	
2:30 pm	F.	California Rural Policy Task Force	T. Symonds
2:45 pm	G.	Rural Planning Assistance Grants Formula	S. Scherzinger
3:00 pm	H.	Rural Counties Task Force Web Board	K. Jacobs
3:15 pm	I.	Election of Officers for 2002	All
3:30 pm	J.	Status Report on RCTF Issues	See attached list
4:00 pm		Adjourn	

DRAFT
California Rural Counties Task Force
November 16, 2001
Meeting Minutes

CALIFORNIA RURAL COUNTIES TASK FORCE

*CELIA McADAM, CHAIR
PLACER COUNTY TRANS. PLANNING AGENCY
(530) 823-4030*

*DARIN GROSSI, VICE CHAIR
TUOLUMNE CO/CITIES AREA PLAN. COUNCIL
(209) 533-5601*

*WALT ALLEN, SECRETARY
TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR MONTEREY COUNTY
(831) 775-0903*

To: Rural Counties Task Force Participants

From: Celia McAdam, Chair

SUBJECT: 2002 STIP Overview/Schedule
a. Draft 2002 ITIP

Issue

Under SB 45, regions develop Regional Transportation Improvement Programs (RTIPs) and Caltrans develops an Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP), which are then submitted for adoption into the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). RTIPs and the ITIP were due to Caltrans and the CTC by December 15, 2001.

Discussion

Northern California STIP hearings are scheduled for January 23 and 24 in Sacramento, with Southern California hearings set for January 30 in Van Nuys. David Brewer will provide an overview of the procedures for the STIP adoption, including tips on presentations and other critical information.

Attached is the draft 2002 ITIP, as released by Caltrans in December. Scott McGowen will be available to answer questions.

2002 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)
Statewide Proposed Project Listing
(All Dollars shown are in thousands)

						2002 ITIP - Proposed Recommendation			
Proj. No.	County	Rte	Project Description	TOTAL ESTIMATED COST	Total Existing Funds	2002 Component	2002 Proposed ITIP	2002 Assumed from RTIP/Other	Const Year
SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA and CENTRAL COAST									
1	ALA	Rail	Emeryville Intermodal Transfer Station - Parking Garage Project	\$ 10,800		CON	\$ 4,200	\$5,000 ALA \$1,600 City of Emeryville	02/03
2	ALA	Rail	BART-Coliseum/Intercity Rail Station to Airport Connector	\$ 232,200	\$ 149,200	CON	\$ 10,000	\$ 38,000	03/04
3	ALA	Rail	ACE Stations & Track Upgrades	\$ 6,000	\$ 4,600	CON	\$ 1,000	\$400 ACCMA	02/03
4	CC	80	HOV: Rte 4 to Carquinez Bridge (WB - Phase 1)	\$ 36,500	\$ 6,500	R/W CON	\$ 25,000	\$ 5,000	03/04
5	CC	Rail	Richmond Intermodal Transfer Station	\$ 4,100		PS&E CON	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,100	02/03
6	CC ALA	24	Caldecott Tunnel - Add 4th Bore	\$ 451,000	\$ 36,000	PA&ED	\$ 2,000	\$2,000 CC	09/10

PA and ED: Project Approval and Environmental Doc
PS and E: Plans, Specifications Estimates
R/W: Right of Way
CON: Construction or Vehicle Purchase

2002 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)
Statewide Proposed Project Listing
(All Dollars shown are in thousands)

						2002 ITIP - Proposed Recommendation			
Proj. No.	County	Rte	Project Description	TOTAL ESTIMATED COST	Total Existing Funds	2002 Component	2002 Proposed ITIP	2002 Assumed from RTIP/Other	Const Year
7	MON	1	Carmel Corridor Improvements	\$ 131,399		PA&ED	\$ 1,000	\$ 2,000	08/09
8	MON	156	Rte. 156 West Corridor (Castroville-Prunedale)-Widen to 4 Lane Expwy	\$ 94,257	\$ 4,501	PA&ED	\$ 1,506	\$ -	07/08
9	MRN SON	101	Marin/Son Narrows, widen for HOV from SR37 in Marin to Old Redwood Hwy in Sonoma.	\$ 489,852	\$ 34,750	PS&E R/W	\$ 11,600	\$2,200 MRN \$2,200 SON	08/09
10	NAP SOL	12	Jamieson Cyn - Widen 4-6 Lanes	\$ 103,200	\$ 7,000	PS&E	\$ 2,000	\$2,000 NAP	08/09
11	SB	101	Santa Maria 6-Lane	\$ 23,918	\$ 22,418	CON	\$ 261	\$ 1,239	03/04
12	SB	Rail	Extend Rail Siding in SB County	\$ 4,200		CON	\$ 4,000	\$ 200	02/03
13	SBT SCL SCL	156 156 152	SBT 156 Widening and IC at 152/156 (Casa de Fruita)	\$ 161,667		PA&ED	\$ 2,600	\$ -	10/11

PA and ED: Project Approval and Environmental Doc
PS and E: Plans, Specifications Estimates
R/W: Right of Way
CON: Construction or Vehicle Purchase

2002 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)
Statewide Proposed Project Listing
(All Dollars shown are in thousands)

						2002 ITIP - Proposed Recommendation			
Proj. No.	County	Rte	Project Description	TOTAL ESTIMATED COST	Total Existing Funds	2002 Component	2002 Proposed ITIP	2002 Assumed from RTIP/Other	Const Year
14	SCL	101	Rte 87 to Trimble Rd - Add NB Aux Lane	\$ 30,100	\$ 10,800	R/W CON	\$ 18,000	\$ 1,300	02/03
15	SCL	Rail	San Jose-Santa Clara 4th Main Track	\$ 66,167		CON	\$ 17,900	\$ -	02/03
16	SF	101	Doyle Drive	\$ 440,200	\$ 22,200	PS&E	\$ 28,000	\$ 8,000	05/06
17	SLO	46	Sr-46 Corridor Improvements (Shandon)	\$ 110,458	\$ 61,164	R/W	\$ 8,384	\$ 1,449	04/05
18	SLO	101	Operational Improvements (6 aux Ins. & 1 intersection improv) 0.2 km north of 227/101 Sep. to Avila Rd. UC	\$ 17,641	\$ 1,108	PS&E R/W	\$ 711	\$ 710	05/06
19	SLO KER	41	Extend Truck Climbing Lane-- 1.1 km W. to 2.1 km E of SLO County Line	\$ 5,742	\$ 955	CON	\$ 3,930	\$ 857	02/03
20	SLO SB	101	Santa Maria River Bridge Widening	\$ 43,200		PA&ED	\$ 1,140	\$ 760	08/09

PA and ED: Project Approval and Environmental Doc
PS and E: Plans, Specifications Estimates
R/W: Right of Way
CON: Construction or Vehicle Purchase

2002 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)
Statewide Proposed Project Listing
(All Dollars shown are in thousands)

						2002 ITIP - Proposed Recommendation			
Proj. No.	County	Rte	Project Description	TOTAL ESTIMATED COST	Total Existing Funds	2002 Component	2002 Proposed ITIP	2002 Assumed from RTIP/Other	Const Year
21	SM	101	Aux lanes between 3rd & Milbrae Ave	\$ 88,101	\$ 61,100	CON	\$ 12,000	\$14,481 SM \$520 Other	02/03
22	SOL	Rail	Cap Corridor - Bahia Viaduct Track and Bridge Upgrade	\$ 2,250		PA&ED PS&E CON	\$ 2,250	\$ -	02/03
TOTAL - SF Bay Area and Central Coast							\$ 159,482	\$ 92,016	
Central Valley and Northern California									
23	BUT	149	Near Oroville - Route 70 to Route 99 - construct 4-In Exp & 2 Fwy to Fwy I/C	\$ 99,921	\$ 72,821	CON	\$ 20,000	\$ 7,100	01/02
24	BUT YUB	70	Marysville-Oroville - Route 65 (Yuba County) to south of Route 162 (Butte County) - construct expressway (route adoption)	\$ 366,500	\$ 6,000	PS&E	\$ 7,000	\$3,390 BUT (\$610 Local from But Co) \$3,000 YOL	06/07 08/09 09/10
25	CAL	4	Angels Camp Bypass	\$ 31,438	\$ 11,295	CON	\$ 15,270	\$ 4,873	04/05

PA and ED: Project Approval and Environmental Doc
PS and E: Plans, Specifications Estimates
R/W: Right of Way
CON: Construction or Vehicle Purchase

2002 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)
Statewide Proposed Project Listing
(All Dollars shown are in thousands)

Proj. No.	County	Rte	Project Description	TOTAL ESTIMATED COST	Total Existing Funds	2002 ITIP - Proposed Recommendation			
						2002 Component	2002 Proposed ITIP	2002 Assumed from RTIP/Other	Const Year
26	ED	50	Placerville - Lawyer Drive to Bedford Avenue - operational improvements	\$ 31,893	\$ 24,493	CON	\$ 4,400	\$ 3,000	03/04
27	FRE	41	County Line Expressway	\$ 45,580	\$ 1,080	PS&E R/W	\$ 10,000	\$ -	05/06
28	FRE	99	Kingsburg-Selma 4F-6F, Rte 201-Rte 43	\$ 61,490	\$ 25,525	CON	\$ 35,965	\$ -	02/03
29	KER	14	Freeman Gulch Widening	\$ 85,790		PA&ED	\$ 1,520	\$ 2,290	11/12
30	KER	46	Keck's Rd to Interstate 5 - 4 Lane Expressway	\$ 177,395	\$ 31,050	R/W	\$ 21,500	\$ 19,800	06/07
31	KER	395	Mojave Fencing	\$ 1,007	\$ 587	CON	\$ 420	\$ -	02/03

PA and ED: Project Approval and Environmental Doc
PS and E: Plans, Specifications Estimates
R/W: Right of Way
CON: Construction or Vehicle Purchase

2002 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)
Statewide Proposed Project Listing
(All Dollars shown are in thousands)

						2002 ITIP - Proposed Recommendation			
Proj. No.	County	Rte	Project Description	TOTAL ESTIMATED COST	Total Existing Funds	2002 Component	2002 Proposed ITIP	2002 Assumed from RTIP/Other	Const Year
32	LAS	36	Near Susanville - Jensen Slough to Rte 395 - add two lanes	\$ 18,931	\$ 220	PS&E R/W	\$ 392	\$ 916	04/05
33	LAS	36	Susanville - Eagle Lake Road to Quarry Street - reconfigure Prattville Road/Route 36 connection	\$ 5,260	\$ 860	R/W CON	\$ 2,200	\$ 2,200	03/04
34	MAD	99	Fairmead, Fwy Conversion 4E-6F with I/C at Ave 22	\$ 47,664	\$ 7,104	R/W-inc CON	\$ 40,560	\$ -	03/04
35	MAD	Rail	Madera - New Station Project	\$ 800		PS&E R/W CON	\$ 800	\$ -	02/03
36	MER	99	Fwy conversion - Livingston II	\$ 34,641	\$ 29,570	CON	\$ 5,071	\$ -	02/03
37	MER	99	Fwy conversion - Atwater	\$ 41,256	\$ 36,081	CON	\$ 5,175	\$ -	03/04

PA and ED: Project Approval and Environmental Doc
PS and E: Plans, Specifications Estimates
R/W: Right of Way
CON: Construction or Vehicle Purchase

2002 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)
Statewide Proposed Project Listing
(All Dollars shown are in thousands)

						2002 ITIP - Proposed Recommendation			
Proj. No.	County	Rte	Project Description	TOTAL ESTIMATED COST	Total Existing Funds	2002 Component	2002 Proposed ITIP	2002 Assumed from RTIP/Other	Const Year
38	MER	99	Madera County-Buchanan Hollow, Fwy Conversion	\$ 100,791	\$ 6,493	R/W	\$ 17,668	\$ -	05/06
39	NEV	49	Grass Valley - Wolf/Combie Road to south of Grass Valley - convert 2-lane conventional to 4-lane expressway with continuous left turn (Phase 1)	\$ 108,960	\$ 1,410	PS&E R/W	\$ 8,375	\$ 8,375	06/07
40	PLA	65	Lincoln Bypass -Industrial Blvd to Yuba Co Line - construct new 4 lane expressway	\$ 189,556	\$ 33,146	CON	\$ 78,205	\$ 78,205	04/05
41	PLA	80	Rocklin - Sierra College Boulevard - interchange modifications	\$ 19,600		CON	\$ 11,000	\$7,432 PLA \$1,168 Other	03/04
42	PLA SAC	80	Near Sacramento - west of County line to Route 65 - Add HOV lanes in both directions and aux lanes in selected locations	\$ 111,400	\$ 2,000	PS&E	\$ 2,600	\$ 2,000	05/06
43	SAC PLA	Rail	Sacramento to Roseville Track Proj - Final Design and Env Doc	\$ 6,980	\$ 450	PA&ED PS&E	\$ 3,530	\$ 3,000	02/03

PA and ED: Project Approval and Environmental Doc
PS and E: Plans, Specifications Estimates
R/W: Right of Way
CON: Construction or Vehicle Purchase

2002 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)
Statewide Proposed Project Listing
(All Dollars shown are in thousands)

						2002 ITIP - Proposed Recommendation			
Proj. No.	County	Rte	Project Description	TOTAL ESTIMATED COST	Total Existing Funds	2002 Component	2002 Proposed ITIP	2002 Assumed from RTIP/Other	Const Year
44	SAC	5	I-5 Traffic Operations System - Southbound I-5 between 5/80 IC and Pocket Rd off ramp.	\$ 6,151	\$ 421	CON	\$ 3,000	\$ 2,730	02/03
45	SAC	Rail	Elk Grove Intercity Rail Station	\$ 800		CON	\$ 800	-	03/04
46	SAC	50	Sacramento - Downtown to Sunrise Boulevard - construct HOV lanes	\$ 96,500		PA&ED	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	07/08
47	SHA	299	Redding - ACID Canal Bridge to east of Sacramento River Bridge, and at Route 5/44/299 separation - construct westbound auxiliary lane and widen bridge	\$ 30,058	\$ 800	PS&E R/W CON	\$ 14,629	\$ 14,629	03/04
48	SHA	299	In Redding - Liberty to I-5 - construct eastbound auxiliary lane and widen bridge	\$ 10,114		PS&E R/W CON	\$ 2,936	\$ 7,178	03/04
49	SHA	299	Buckhorn Grade - Environmental Only Near Lewiston - west of Shasta County line to near Clear Creek Bridge - realign roadway	\$ 119,865	\$ 2,288	PA&ED (inc)	\$ 3,146	-	06/07

PA and ED: Project Approval and Environmental Doc
PS and E: Plans, Specifications Estimates
R/W: Right of Way
CON: Construction or Vehicle Purchase

2002 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)
Statewide Proposed Project Listing
(All Dollars shown are in thousands)

						2002 ITIP - Proposed Recommendation			
Proj. No.	County	Rte	Project Description	TOTAL ESTIMATED COST	Total Existing Funds	2002 Component	2002 Proposed ITIP	2002 Assumed from RTIP/Other	Const Year
50	SIS	97	Near Dorris - south of Richardson Rd to 0.5 miles south of the Indian Tom Lake Road- construct 2-lane expressway	\$ 23,670	\$ 18,870	R/W CON-inc	\$ 2,800	\$ 2,000	03/04
51	SJ	99	Rte 99 Widening in North Stockton	\$ 39,178	\$ 31,456	CON	\$ 4,251	\$2,467 SJ \$1,004 Other	02/03
52	SJ	205	Tracy, Rte 5- 11th Ave, widen to 6 lane freeway	\$ 96,606	\$ 30,904	CON	\$ 38,582	\$ 27,120	03/04
53	SJ	Rail	Stockton to Escalon Phase 2	\$ 36,200		CON	\$ 24,200	\$ -	02/03
54	SJ	Rail	Stockton Station and Platform ACE Station	\$ 12,573	\$ 8,173	CON	\$ 3,400	\$ 1,000	02/03
55	SJ ALA ALA	205 205 580	205/580 Ultimate Truck Bypass	\$ 69,856		PA&ED	\$ 930	\$ -	09/10
56	SJ STA	132	Route 132- Construct 4-lane Divided Highway	\$ 18,584	\$ 2,500	R/W	\$ 517	\$517 SJCOG	05/06

PA and ED: Project Approval and Environmental Doc
PS and E: Plans, Specifications Estimates
R/W: Right of Way
CON: Construction or Vehicle Purchase

2002 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)
Statewide Proposed Project Listing
(All Dollars shown are in thousands)

						2002 ITIP - Proposed Recommendation			
Proj. No.	County	Rte	Project Description	TOTAL ESTIMATED COST	Total Existing Funds	2002 Component	2002 Proposed ITIP	2002 Assumed from RTIP/Other	Const Year
57	STA	120	Oakdale Bypass	\$ 102,106	\$75,849	R/W CON	\$ 19,692	\$ 6,565	03/04
58	SUT	99	Sutter 99 Corridor-Central Ave to O'Bannion Road - widen to 4 lanes with a median	\$ 48,797	\$ 9,461	CON	\$ 30,912	\$ 8,424	04/05
59	TEH	5	Red Bluff - north Red Bluff Interchange to north of Wilcox Road Overcrossing - construct northbound median lane	\$ 6,769	\$ 500	R/W	\$ 27	\$ -	04/05
60	TEH	5	Near Red Bluff - north of the Nine Mile Hill Overcrossing - construct northbound median lane	\$ 7,047	\$ 500	R/W	\$ 26	\$ -	04/05
61	TRI	299	Near Lewiston - east of Buckhorn Maintenance Station - construct westbound passing lane	\$ 4,682		PA&ED PS&E R/W CON	\$ 2,682	\$ 2,000	04/05
62	TUL	99	Tagus Ranch Six-Lane	\$ 75,700		PA&ED	\$ 1,600	\$ -	10/11
63	YOL	50	West Sacramento - Harbor Boulevard - interchange modifications	\$ 31,370	\$ 350	PA&ED PS&E R/W	\$ 5,360	\$ 5,360	04/05

PA and ED: Project Approval and Environmental Doc
PS and E: Plans, Specifications Estimates
R/W: Right of Way
CON: Construction or Vehicle Purchase

2002 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)
Statewide Proposed Project Listing
(All Dollars shown are in thousands)

						2002 ITIP - Proposed Recommendation			
Proj. No.	County	Rte	Project Description	TOTAL ESTIMATED COST	Total Existing Funds	2002 Component	2002 Proposed ITIP	2002 Assumed from RTIP/Other	Const Year
64	YOL SAC	80	I-80 Traffic Operations system - west of Yolo Causeway to Route 244 connector	\$ 5,707	\$ 1,082	CON	\$ 3,000	\$ 1,625	03/04
TOTAL - Central Valley & Northern California							\$ 388,220	\$ 224,128	
LOS ANGELES BASIN / SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA									
65	INY	395	Independence 4-lane	\$ 23,356	\$ 3,863	R/W	\$ 298	\$ -	04/05
66	INY	395	Manzanar 4 - Lane	\$ 20,137	\$ 19,217	CON	\$ 920	\$ -	03/04
67	INY	395	Olancho/Cartago 4 lane exp	\$ 82,928	\$ 4,190	R/W	\$ 3,984	\$ 5,977	08/09
68	LA	5	Rte 5 Widenings and Interchanges	\$ 471,279	\$ 319,259	CON	\$ 17,000	\$ 35,996	03/04
69	LA	47	In Los Angeles and Long Beach - Install Communication TOS #4 Field Hardware	\$ 2,800		PA&ED PS&E R/W CON	\$ 2,800	\$ -	04/05

PA and ED: Project Approval and Environmental Doc
PS and E: Plans, Specifications Estimates
R/W: Right of Way
CON: Construction or Vehicle Purchase

2002 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)
Statewide Proposed Project Listing
(All Dollars shown are in thousands)

						2002 ITIP - Proposed Recommendation			
Proj. No.	County	Rte	Project Description	TOTAL ESTIMATED COST	Total Existing Funds	2002 Component	2002 Proposed ITIP	2002 Assumed from RTIP/Other	Const Year
70	LA	101	Van Nuys Boulevard Off-Ramps at US 101/ I-405	\$ 9,000		R/W CON	\$ 9,000	\$ -	04/05
71	LA	110	Access Improvement Project SR-110/Temple Street	\$ 18,050		PA&ED	\$ 2,000	\$ -	04/05
72	LA	134	Burbank - between Hollywood Way and Alameda Avenue - modify interchange, construct new ramps	\$ 33,167	\$ 14,259	CON	\$ 9,454	\$ 9,454	02/03
73	LA	138	Rte 138 Widening Project	\$ 21,887	\$ 4,487	CON	\$ 10,000	\$ 7,400	
74	LA	405	Gap Closure (Near Greenleaf I/C)	\$ 38,911	\$ 31,338	CON	\$ 3,786	\$ 3,787	03/04
75	LA	405	HOV&Aux Lane I-10 to Waterford	\$ 59,462	\$ 32,403	R/W CON	\$ 13,538	\$ 13,521	03/04
76	LA	710	Rte 710 - Arterial Improvements in Pasadena	\$ 29,310	\$ 27,310	CON	\$ 2,000	\$ -	06/07
77	LA	710	Rte 710 - Arterial Improvements in Los Angeles	\$ 16,150	\$ 11,150	CON	\$ 5,000	\$ -	06/07

PA and ED: Project Approval and Environmental Doc
PS and E: Plans, Specifications Estimates
R/W: Right of Way
CON: Construction or Vehicle Purchase

2002 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)
Statewide Proposed Project Listing
(All Dollars shown are in thousands)

						2002 ITIP - Proposed Recommendation			
Proj. No.	County	Rte	Project Description	TOTAL ESTIMATED COST	Total Existing Funds	2002 Component	2002 Proposed ITIP	2002 Assumed from RTIP/Other	Const Year
78	LA	710	In Long Beach - Install Communication TOS #4 Field Hardware	\$ 4,725		PA&ED PS&E R/W CON	\$ 4,725	\$ -	04/05
79	LA	Rail	SCRRA - Los Angeles Storage Facilities and Tracks	\$ 5,000		PS&E CON	\$ 5,000	\$ -	03/04
80	LA ORA	Rail	DT Junction to La Mirada-Triple Track	\$ 43,000	\$ 3,000	PS&E CON	\$ 5,000	\$ -	02/03
81	LA VEN	Rail	SCRRA - Tunnel 26 Seismic Improvements	\$ 13,712	\$ 3,712	PS&E CON	\$ 10,000	\$ -	03/04
82	MNO	395	Highpoint Curve Corrections	\$ 19,910		PA&ED	\$ 525	\$ 787	09/10
83	ORA	91	Route 91 WB Lane Drop Restoration	\$ 7,935		PA&ED PS&E R/W CON	\$ 7,935	\$ -	05/06
84	ORA	91 Rail	Yorba Linda Commuter Rail Station	\$ 8,000	\$ 3,000	CON	\$ 5,000	\$ -	03/04

PA and ED: Project Approval and Environmental Doc
PS and E: Plans, Specifications Estimates
R/W: Right of Way
CON: Construction or Vehicle Purchase

2002 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)
Statewide Proposed Project Listing
(All Dollars shown are in thousands)

Proj. No.	County	Rte	Project Description	TOTAL ESTIMATED COST	Total Existing Funds	2002 ITIP - Proposed Recommendation			
						2002 Component	2002 Proposed ITIP	2002 Assumed from RTIP/Other	Const Year
85	ORA	Rail	Alameda Corridor East; Orangethorpe Corridor; Placentia Avenue Railroad Grade Separation	\$ 21,550	\$ 15,150	CON	\$ 2,200	\$1,100 OCTA \$1,100 Placentia \$2,000 BNSF	03/04
86	ORA	Rail	Fullerton Parking Expansion	\$ 10,000		PS&E CON	\$ 3,000	\$ -	02/03
87	RIV	71	Also Riv-91 R1.2/R2.1; Construct Eastbound 91 to Northbound 71 Connector	\$ 24,078	\$ 2,204	R/W	\$ 20	\$ -	04/05
88	RIV	91	Reconstruct Green River IC and construct aux lane (EB Rte 91)	\$ 19,244	\$ 11,466	R/W CON	\$ 3,889	\$ 3,889	03/04
89	RIV	91 Rail	Construct 1,000 space parking structure at proposed Corona N. Main St. Station	\$ 11,000		PA&ED PS&E CON	\$ 11,000	\$ -	04/05
90	RIV	91 Rail	Purchase two new cab cars and three locomotives for Riverside -Fullerton-LA and IEOC lines	\$ 14,693		CON	\$ 12,000	\$2,693 Local (Prop C)	02/03
91	SBD	10	Installation of Traffic Management System elements and construction of Aux Lanes	\$ 10,600	\$ -	PA&ED PS&E R/W CON	\$ 10,000	\$600 CMAQ	03/04

PA and ED: Project Approval and Environmental Doc
PS and E: Plans, Specifications Estimates
R/W: Right of Way
CON: Construction or Vehicle Purchase

2002 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)
Statewide Proposed Project Listing
(All Dollars shown are in thousands)

Proj. No.	County	Rte	Project Description	TOTAL ESTIMATED COST	Total Existing Funds	2002 ITIP - Proposed Recommendation			
						2002 Component	2002 Proposed ITIP	2002 Assumed from RTIP/Other	Const Year
92	SBD	10	Reconstruct I-10/Tippecanoe Interchange and add Auxiliary Lanes	\$ 30,000	\$ 6,750	PA&ED	\$ 2,500	\$ 700	09/10
93	SBD	15	SB truck climbing lane	\$ 20,569	\$ 700	R/W CON	\$ 19,869	\$ -	04/05
94	SBD	58	Near Kramer Jct, 4 lane expressway	\$ 137,075	\$ 4,489	PS&E R/W	\$ 19,882	\$ -	05/06
95	SBD	58	Near Hinkley, Realign & widen to 4 lane expressway	\$ 112,793	\$ 11,083	R/W	\$ 3,924	\$ -	05/06
96	SBD	138	Widen to 4 Lanes with Median LTL (Phase 1)	\$ 91,508	\$ 6,584	PS&E-inc R/W CON	\$ 41,274	\$ 15,000	06/07
97	SBD	395	Jct 1-15/US-395 to 0.5 Mi S/o Farmington Rd; Realign &/or widen to 4-or 6 lane frwy or expwy & modify or construct New IC	\$ 975,936		PA&ED	\$ 4,000	\$4,000 SBD \$2,000 MNO (loc) \$2,000 KERN (loc) \$2,000 INYO (loc)	10/11
98	VEN	101	La Conchita, Mussel Shoals	\$ 40,000	\$ 1,500	PS&E	\$ 1,800	\$ -	04/05

PA and ED: Project Approval and Environmental Doc
PS and E: Plans, Specifications Estimates
R/W: Right of Way
CON: Construction or Vehicle Purchase

2002 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)
Statewide Proposed Project Listing
(All Dollars shown are in thousands)

						2002 ITIP - Proposed Recommendation			
Proj. No.	County	Rte	Project Description	TOTAL ESTIMATED COST	Total Existing Funds	2002 Component	2002 Proposed ITIP	2002 Assumed from RTIP/Other	Const Year
99	VEN	Rail	SCRRA - Safety Improvements to Crossings Moorpark to Simi Valley	\$ 700		PS&E CON	\$ 700	\$ -	02/03
100	VEN	Rail	SCRRA - Replacement Rail Moorpark to Simi Valley	\$ 4,000		CON	\$ 4,000	\$ -	02/03
TOTAL - Los Angeles Basin and Southern California							\$ 258,023	\$ 114,004	
SAN DIEGO REGION									
101	IMP	7	Construct 4-lane expressway	\$ 71,821	\$ 53,721	R/W	\$ 6,042	\$ 4,558	02/03
102	SD	15	I-15 Managed Lanes - San Diego and Escondido	\$ 375,000	\$ 150,000	CON	\$ 41,000	\$ 50,000	02/03
103	SD	15	I-15 TOPS - Operational Improvements (Poway Road to Mercy Road)	\$ 10,000	\$ 6,000	CON	\$ 4,000	\$ -	02/03
104	SD	15	I-15 TOPS - Construct SB Aux Lane (0.5km So of Los Penasquitos Creek Bridge to 0.3km north)	\$ 8,996	\$ 4,296	CON	\$ 4,700	\$ -	02/03
105	SD	15	I-15 TOPS - Operational Improvements (Mercy Road to Miramar Way-SB Lanes)	\$ 40,000	\$ 14,500	CON	\$ 3,500	\$ -	01/02

PA and ED: Project Approval and Environmental Doc
PS and E: Plans, Specifications Estimates
R/W: Right of Way
CON: Construction or Vehicle Purchase

2002 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)
Statewide Proposed Project Listing
(All Dollars shown are in thousands)

						2002 ITIP - Proposed Recommendation			
Proj. No.	County	Rte	Project Description	TOTAL ESTIMATED COST	Total Existing Funds	2002 Component	2002 Proposed ITIP	2002 Assumed from RTIP/Other	Const Year
106	SD	905	Construct 6-lane Freeway (Stage 1)	\$ 292,300	\$ 217,544	CON	\$ 8,000	\$ 2,000	03/04
107	SD	Rail	Del Mar Bluffs Stabilization	\$ 18,500	\$ 4,500	CON	\$ 1,000	\$ -	02/03
108	SD	Rail	Oceanside Parking Structure	\$ 7,600	\$ 4,900	CON	\$ 2,700	\$ -	02/03
TOTAL - SAN DIEGO							\$ 70,942	\$ 56,558	
VARIOUS REGIONS									
109	VAR		Smart Parking			CON	\$ 2,219		02/03
110	VAR		Carsharing			CON	\$ 12,736		02/03
TOTAL - Various							\$ 14,955	\$ -	
STATEWIDE TOTAL							\$ 891,622	\$ 486,706	

CALIFORNIA RURAL COUNTIES TASK FORCE

*CELIA McADAM, CHAIR
PLACER COUNTY TRANS. PLANNING AGENCY
(530) 823-4030*

*DARIN GROSSI, VICE CHAIR
TUOLUMNE CO/CITIES AREA PLAN. COUNCIL
(209) 533-5601*

*WALT ALLEN, SECRETARY
TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR MONTEREY COUNTY
(831) 775-0903*

To: Rural Counties Task Force Participants
From: Celia McAdam, Chair
SUBJECT: State Only Funding Outlook for 2002 STIP

Issue

Caltrans staff has raised concerns that the amount of state only funding available may not be sufficient for the demands, and there may be need to prioritize state only funding requests. Caltrans Programming has been analyzing the state only funding requests received as part of the various regions' RTIP submittals, and are scheduled to report by January 15 if there will be a shortfall.

Discussion

State only funding is particularly important to rural areas for several reasons. First, it provides the state match for federal STIP dollars. More importantly, however, it allows small projects, such as road rehabilitation, to avoid the cumbersome and costly requirements to federalize a project.

Caltrans first brought up the possibility that there might be a shortage of state only funding back in late 2000. In February 2001, a committee including representatives from Caltrans, regional agencies, jurisdictions, and the Rural Counties Task Force developed some draft criteria to prioritize state only project funding. The crisis was averted, so the criteria were not further pursued at that time. These draft criteria are attached.

Meanwhile, it was agreed that the "first come, first serve" basis that state only funding had been allocated under previously should be changed. As a result, the 2002 RTIP submittals were to include state only funding requests, so that the funding can be looked at in its entirety. If it turned out that there is projected to be sufficient state only funds to meet the requests, then prioritization will not be necessary. If, however, there is a higher demand, then further work on prioritization will be needed.

Scott McGowen and David Saxby will provide information about the requests for state only funds, if there is projected to be a shortfall and, if so, how much.

State Transportation Improvement Program
State Only Funding Policy
Regional Transportation Planning Agencies'
Draft Recommendations

Overall Goals:

- a. Efficiently focus state-only funding on projects that can most benefit from this resource.
- b. Protect small agencies with limited staff from the burden of the federal process.
- c. Ensure that non-federal funds are available to match federal funds.

Recommended State-Only Funding Policies

1. **First Priority for State Only Funds:** automatically give state-only funding to the following project categories:
 - a. Federally-funded projects that require state matching funds;
 - b. Projects that are not eligible for federal funds, e.g. projects off the federal-aid system or rail operating funds; and,
 - c. Local road rehabilitation projects in very small jurisdictions, based on population (potential population threshold could be <50,000 for counties, <10,000 for cities).
2. **Second Priority for State Only Funds:** give second priority to projects in the following categories, upon request, subject to CTC discretion and availability of funds:
 - a. Local road rehabilitation projects in small jurisdictions, based on a slightly higher population threshold (potentially <100,000 for counties and <25,000 for cities);
 - b. Local projects below a certain cost (cost threshold to be determined based on funding availability);
 - c. Special projects, on a case by case basis, with an overwhelming reason for remaining state-only funded other than just to avoid the National Environmental Policy Act.
3. **Improve Management of State Funding:**
 - a. Add a check box on the project programming form to designate whether or not the agency requires any state funds in the STIP allocation. (Certain projects already have more than the required match in local funds). Projects with sufficient match from other sources will be programmed in the STIP with 100% federal funds.
 - b. Have Caltrans and the RTPA informally review the STIP programming request to verify whether or not projects with a large local funding share will need state funds.
 - c. Request project sponsors to notify Caltrans and the CTC if their state-only project becomes subject to federal requirements, so that state-only STIP funds can be exchanged for federal funds.
 - d. Every STIP cycle, review the availability of state-only funds and set the eligibility thresholds for state-only funded projects (i.e. population and project size) accordingly.
 - e. Develop a more streamlined federal process for categorically exempt projects.
4. **Guarantee State-Only Funding at STIP Programming:**
 - a. Projects should be guaranteed state-only funding at the time of STIP programming, rather than at the time of allocation, barring an unexpected drop in the availability of state funds. Federal projects follow a different path than state-only projects from the beginning. A project that starts out as state-only funded will have to restart the environmental process if it becomes federalized. It is therefore important for project sponsors to know whether or not they will have to follow the federal process at the time their STIP funds are programmed.
 - b. Projects programmed for state-only funds in the 1998 STIP should be grandfathered in for state-only funds. Shifting these projects to federal funds may significantly delay them.

CALIFORNIA RURAL COUNTIES TASK FORCE

CELIA McADAM, CHAIR
PLACER COUNTY TRANS. PLANNING AGENCY
(530) 823-4030

DARIN GROSSI, VICE CHAIR
TUOLUMNE CO/CITIES AREA PLAN. COUNCIL
(209) 533-5601

WALT ALLEN, SECRETARY
TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR MONTEREY COUNTY
(831) 775-0903

To: Rural Counties Task Force Participants

From: Celia McAdam, Chair

SUBJECT: Proposed Revisions to STIP Criteria

- a. Road Rehabilitation Eligibility
- b. CSAC Transportation and Public Works Financing Policy and Revenue Principles

Issue

With the upcoming adoption of the 2002 STIP, the potential reform of STIP criteria has been raised by several RCTF members. One issue is the possibility that the CTC and/or Caltrans may seek to limit or even eliminate the eligibility of road rehabilitation projects in the STIP. Another issue is the proposal, supported by the California State Association of Counties, to convert some STIP funding to block grants to local jurisdictions.

Discussion

Speculation has been ongoing since the adoption of the criteria which allows local regions to program road rehabilitation in the STIP as to whether this would be allowed permanently. The inclusion of Proposition 42 on March 2002 ballot to provide a permanent (though insufficient) flow of gasoline sales tax funds to jurisdictions for road rehabilitation has further fueled the speculation that, should Proposition 42 pass, the CTC would act to eliminate road rehabilitation from the STIP.

Phil Dow of Lake and Mendocino Counties has taken the lead on this issue by developing some draft criteria to preserve the ability of small jurisdictions to use STIP dollars for road rehabilitation. These criteria are attached for RCTF member review and discussion.

Another proposal has been circulated by the California Association of Counties (CSAC) regarding transportation funding reform. The proposal urges funding via block grants directly to jurisdictions. Attached are the Financing Policy and Revenue Principles adopted by the Transportation and Public Works Policy Committee of CSAC, as provided by Kevin Rosser of Tehama County.

MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

POSITION PAPER

December 18, 2001

Issue:

Local streets and roads rehabilitation as an eligible activity in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

Discussion:

Prior to the 1998 STIP Augmentation cycle, rehabilitation was not identified as an eligible activity. Rehabilitation was added to the California Transportation Commission's STIP guidelines as an eligible activity after Congress passed TEA-21 in June 1998. Federal funds flowing into the STIP suddenly far exceeded prior projections at a time when local agencies were desperate to find ways to fund the growing rehabilitation backlog, and many counties had been hit with severe storm damage.

Senate Resolution 8 (Burton, 1999) further defined the extent of the maintenance and rehabilitation backlog on the local system. Rehabilitation remained as an eligible activity in the 2000 STIP cycle as well as the 2002 STIP cycle. Although there was speculation that the activity would sometime become ineligible, there were sometimes CTC staff references that the Commission would retain rehabilitation until the maintenance and rehabilitation problem at the local level is addressed.

Proposition 42 will appear before the California voters in March, 2002. Opinion surveys now indicate that it has a good chance of passing. If it does pass it will provide a permanent source of funding directly to cities and counties that can be used exclusively to deal with the maintenance and rehabilitation backlog. Revenues generated by the sales tax on gasoline are substantial, and in some areas (particularly urban areas) it has already been projected that these additional revenues will be sufficient to retire the rehabilitation backlog. Due to the distribution formula, Proposition 42 will be less effective in the rural counties and have minimal effect in the small cities. Proposition 42, by itself, is not the total answer to the maintenance and rehabilitation problem in most rural areas and may inadequate as well in small urban cities.

Caltrans Director Morales has already indicated that Caltrans will recommend that future guidelines be amended to remove rehabilitation from the list of eligible activities. The motivation, it appears, is to return the emphasis of the STIP to capital projects (a position that is not without merit). If Proposition 42 passes there will likely be a call to amend the STIP guidelines and declare victory over the local maintenance and rehabilitation problem. There may be plenty of support from urban agencies that may justifiably see an end to this problem with the projected revenue stream.

Given that Proposition 42 does not provide the entire solution, and that restoring the STIP emphasis to capital improvement is justified, the question of whether or not rehabilitation should remain as an eligible STIP activity should not be answered with a simple "yes or no". It should be conditional, dependent upon satisfying certain criteria.

Therefore, I am proposing that rehabilitation project eligibility be made conditional based on satisfying any one of the following criteria:

Criterion 1: Small County Eligibility

Rehabilitation shall remain an eligible activity in small counties (less than 50,000 population).

The smallest counties are perhaps the least likely to be able to deal with the rehabilitation backlog. At the same time, the smallest counties are the least likely to have major capital needs on the State highway system due to capacity concerns. In keeping with the spirit of SB 45 reforms, these small counties should be afforded the maximum amount of flexibility. There is ample statewide precedent recognizing the need for special accommodations for the smallest of our counties.

A 50,000 population threshold for this exemption would potentially apply to 15 rural counties that together account for less than 1% of California's population and less than 5% of the 2002 Regional Improvement Program share.

2000 Census Counties < 50,000

Alpine	Mariposa
Amador	Modoc
Calaveras	Mono
Colusa	Plumas
Del Norte	Sierra
Glenn	Siskiyou
Inyo	Trinity
Lassen	

Criterion 2: State Highway Project Readiness

Rehabilitation shall remain an eligible activity in any county in which there are no Project Study Reports (PSR) for State highway projects available to consider for programming at the time Regional Transportation Improvement Programs are due to be adopted.

This situation may arise from time to time, especially in small counties that are funding large projects. In fact, occurred in Mendocino County for the 2002 RTIP. There may be STIP cycles where there are no PSRs for State projects as the environmental process proceeds on these large projects.

Without State projects ripe for funding, regions should be able to utilize the Regional Improvement Program funding where most needed locally. In many cases, this may be for rehabilitation projects on the local system.

If this option were not available, a region may be forced to choose between leaving funds unprogrammed or funding lower priority local projects. Public resources should be expended in a timely manner, and toward the highest needs.

Criterion 3: Sales Tax on Gasoline Component of STIP

Rehabilitation projects may be programmed in any county of any size up to the sales tax amount that is projected by the State to be added to its respective STIP County Share due to AB 2928 and subsequently by Proposition 42 (if approved by the voters in March, 2002).

AB 2928 provides that 40% of existing sales tax revenues on gasoline be distributed directly to counties and cities for transportation purposes. Most use these funds for maintenance and rehabilitation, but the backlog remains too great. More funding needs to be directed to rehabilitation to retire the \$10 billion backlog.

Proposition 42 will make the shift of sales and use tax on gasoline permanent. As discussed, Proposition 42 will go a long way toward solving maintenance and rehabilitation problems in California. But due to distribution formulas and inherent problems in rural areas, the 40% Proposition 42 share that would flow directly to the cities and counties will remain inadequate in rural counties and in small (rural or urban) cities. That essentially is the reason for Criterion 3.

The sales tax on gasoline is really a new funding source for transportation in California. If Proposition 42 passes, there will be an opportunity to return the primary emphasis of the STIP to capital projects through traditional STIP funding sources (federal gas tax, state gas tax, truck weight fees) and still accommodate the counties and small cities that need more than the 40% City-County split to satisfy the rehabilitation backlog.

It is proposed that the amount generated now by AB 2928 and in the future by Proposition 42 (if approved by the voters) that is to flow into the STIP (40% of total) will be made available for rehabilitation programming if needed. The STIP component funded from traditional (federal gas tax, state gas tax, truck weight fees) sources would be retained for other capital activities.

Proposition 42 limits could be projected in the Fund Estimate for each county much the same that new STIP shares and advance project development shares are projected.

Phillip J. Dow, P.E.
Executive Director

TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC WORKS

CHAPTER X

development of the state within a framework of its ability to invest. All people of the state bear a share of the responsibility to ensure proper environmental elements of the transportation system.

Maintenance needs of transportation systems must be met in order to protect existing public investment (current revenues are not keeping pace with needs of local road systems).

The local road system, a large component of the state's transportation network, is critical in order to address congestion, meet farm to market needs, address freight and goods movement and provide access to other public transportation systems.

Public safety, particularly access for public safety services, is dependent on a well-maintained local road network.

Analysis of the cost effectiveness of all modes of transportation, existing and proposed, is needed in order to provide the most coordinated and efficient transportation system.

Additionally, repairs to local access roads that are damaged in the course of emergency operations (for example, in fighting a fire or flood) should be eligible for reimbursement under the same programs as roads which are directly damaged by the event.

System process modifications are needed to expedite project delivery and minimize project cost.

B. FINANCING POLICY AND REVENUE PRINCIPLES

Transportation financing needs exceed existing and foreseeable revenues despite growing recognition of these needs at all levels of government. Additional funding is required and should be supported and any new sources of funding should produce enough revenue to respond significantly to transportation needs.

Multi-jurisdictional boundaries should be variable to recognize different "regions" for different and specific transportation funding needs.

Counties support making block grants for transportation purposes directly to urban, urbanized and rural areas for allocation to local projects and to projects of regional significance in accordance with regional mechanisms developed through a cooperative process by the affected local general purpose governments within each area and without unnecessary involvement of the state or federal government.

Single Transportation Funds--comprised of state and federal subventions--should be available at each of the local, regional and statewide levels for financing the development, operation, and/or maintenance of highways, public transit, airports or any other modal system as determined by each area in accordance with local, regional and statewide goals. The

TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC WORKS

CHAPTER X

cooperative mechanisms established by counties and cities to meet multi-jurisdictional needs should be responsible for the financing, construction, operation and maintenance of regional transportation systems utilizing--as appropriate--existing transportation agencies and districts.

Federal and state funds should be sent directly to applicable operational levels without involvement of any intermediate level of government. Pass-through and block grant funding concepts are highly desirable.

The cost of transportation facilities and services should be fairly shared by the users and also by indirect beneficiaries.

Transportation funding should be established so that annual revenues are predictable with reasonable certainty over several years to permit rational planning for wise expenditure of funds for each mode of transportation.

Financing should be based upon periodic deficiency reports by mode to permit adjustment of necessary funding levels. Additional elements such as constituent acceptance, federal legislative and/or administrative actions, programmatic flexibility and cost benefit studies should be considered.

Efforts to obtain additional revenue should include an examination of administrative costs associated with project delivery and transportation programs.

Funding procedures should be specifically designed to reduce the cost of processing money and to expedite cash flow. Maximum use should be made of existing collection mechanisms when considering additional financing methods.

In the development of long-range financing plans and programs at all levels of government, there should be a realistic appreciation of limitations imposed by time, financing, availability and the possibility of unforeseen changes in community interest.

Rural and urban transportation funding needs must be balanced so as to build and operate a single transportation system.

Existing funding levels must be maintained with historical shares of current funding sources ensured for counties (e.g. state and federal gas tax increases, etc.) and additional revenue sources are needed such as additional gas tax, congestion pricing and user or transaction fees to provide a diverse financing strategy.

Additional revenue sources are needed such as additional gas tax, congestion pricing and user or transaction fees to provide a diverse financing strategy.

CALIFORNIA RURAL COUNTIES TASK FORCE

*CELIA McADAM, CHAIR
PLACER COUNTY TRANS. PLANNING AGENCY
(530) 823-4030*

*DARIN GROSSI, VICE CHAIR
TUOLUMNE CO/CITIES AREA PLAN. COUNCIL
(209) 533-5601*

*WALT ALLEN, SECRETARY
TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR MONTEREY COUNTY
(831) 775-0903*

To: Rural Counties Task Force Participants
From: Celia McAdam, Chair
SUBJECT: California Rural Policy Task Force

Issue

The Governor's Office of Planning and Research has implemented a California Rural Policy Task Force to look at the issues faced by rural areas and develop techniques and ideas the state can best assist in addressing them. The focus includes transportation as a component of the overall provision of government services to rural areas.

Discussion

Toni Symonds of OPR is leading the California Rural Policy Task Force effort and will provide an overview of those activities.

CALIFORNIA RURAL COUNTIES TASK FORCE

*CELIA McADAM, CHAIR
PLACER COUNTY TRANS. PLANNING AGENCY
(530) 823-4030*

*DARIN GROSSI, VICE CHAIR
TUOLUMNE CO/CITIES AREA PLAN. COUNCIL
(209) 533-5601*

*WALT ALLEN, SECRETARY
TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR MONTEREY COUNTY
(831) 775-0903*

To: Rural Counties Task Force Participants
From: Celia McAdam, Chair
SUBJECT: Rural Planning Assistance Grants Formulas

Issue

On November 16, a subcommittee of the RCTF met with Sharon Scherzinger to discuss potential updates to the Rural Planning Assistance (RPA) funding distribution, based on the 2000 census information.

Discussion

The group developed several different scenarios for RPA fund distribution. In the past, the funding has been distributed by population level, with a “bump up” for Inyo and Mono counties to account for tourism traffic.

In each of the proposed scenarios, the population level grouping system was retained, but include various alternatives for the tourism traffic “bump up”.

Attached are the alternatives for discussion and recommendation.

FY 2002/03 Rural Planning Assistance Alternatives Summary Chart

RTPA	FY 01/02 Current Allocation	FY 02/03 No Bump-up Alternative 1	FY 02/03 Reduced Bump-up Alternative 2	FY 02/03 Tourism Bump-up Alternative 3
Alpine	\$60,000	\$62,000	\$60,000	\$60,000
Sierra	\$60,000	\$62,000	\$60,000	\$60,000
Modoc	\$80,000	\$88,000	\$86,000	\$80,000
Trinity	\$80,000	\$88,000	\$86,000	\$80,000
Mono	\$130,000	\$88,000	\$95,000	\$130,000
Mariposa	\$80,000	\$88,000	\$86,000	\$80,000
Inyo	\$130,000	\$88,000	\$95,000	\$130,000
Colusa	\$80,000	\$88,000	\$86,000	\$80,000
Plumas	\$80,000	\$88,000	\$86,000	\$80,000
Glenn	\$130,000	\$130,000	\$130,000	\$130,000
Del Norte	\$130,000	\$130,000	\$130,000	\$130,000
Amador	\$130,000	\$130,000	\$130,000	\$130,000
Lassen	\$130,000	\$130,000	\$130,000	\$130,000
Calaveras	\$130,000	\$130,000	\$130,000	\$130,000
Siskiyou	\$130,000	\$130,000	\$130,000	\$130,000
San Benito	\$130,000	\$170,000	\$170,000	\$170,000
Tuolumne	\$170,000	\$170,000	\$170,000	\$170,000
Tehama	\$170,000	\$170,000	\$170,000	\$170,000
Lake	\$170,000	\$170,000	\$170,000	\$170,000
Mendocino	\$170,000	\$170,000	\$170,000	\$170,000
Nevada	\$170,000	\$170,000	\$170,000	\$170,000
El Dorado	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$190,000
Humboldt	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$190,000
Madera	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$190,000
Kings	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$190,000
Placer	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$205,000
Santa Cruz	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$205,000
Monterey	\$260,000	\$260,000	\$260,000	\$250,000
Totals	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000

CALIFORNIA RURAL COUNTIES TASK FORCE

*CELIA McADAM, CHAIR
PLACER COUNTY TRANS. PLANNING AGENCY
(530) 823-4030*

*DARIN GROSSI, VICE CHAIR
TUOLUMNE CO/CITIES AREA PLAN. COUNCIL
(209) 533-5601*

*WALT ALLEN, SECRETARY
TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR MONTEREY COUNTY
(831) 775-0903*

To: Rural Counties Task Force Participants
From: Celia McAdam, Chair
SUBJECT: Rural Counties Task Force Web Board

Issue

Web boards provide a “bulletin board” to post questions, news, information, and facilitate discussion amongst members via the Internet. This type of tool could be particularly valuable as a communication tool amongst Rural Counties Task Force members.

Discussion

Kathie Jacobs has been working with Caltrans technical staff to develop a RCTF Web Board, which is ready for testing. RCTF members are being assigned passwords. Kathie will provide a demonstration of how the Web Board works and how members can use it most effectively.

CALIFORNIA RURAL COUNTIES TASK FORCE

*CELIA McADAM, CHAIR
PLACER COUNTY TRANS. PLANNING AGENCY
(530) 823-4030*

*DARIN GROSSI, VICE CHAIR
TUOLUMNE CO/CITIES AREA PLAN. COUNCIL
(209) 533-5601*

*WALT ALLEN, SECRETARY
TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR MONTEREY COUNTY
(831) 775-0903*

To: Rural Counties Task Force Participants
From: Celia McAdam, Chair
SUBJECT: Election of Officers for 2002

Issue

Every year, the RCTF selects officers to take effect at the conclusion of the January meeting.

Discussion

The responsibilities of the officers are as follows:

Chair: Coordinates efforts of the RCTF; represents the RCTF on numerous committees, subcommittees, task forces, and other policy advisory groups; represents the RCTF at CTC and RTPA meetings; writes and presents the Semi-Annual RCTF Report to the CTC; coordinates with CTC liaison; develops the bi-monthly RCTF agenda, arranges speakers, and conducts RCTF meetings

Vice-Chair: Provides backup for Chair in above tasks

Secretary: Takes minutes of RCTF meetings; transcribes minutes and makes changes as necessary

RCTF ISSUES AND OBJECTIVES
Report for January 18, 2002

Issue/Objective

SB 45 Implementation Changes Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP) Rural Transit (FTA 5310, Welfare to Work, CalACT)	Darin Grossi, Tuolumne
Formulas for Distribution of Local Road Funds SB 45 Project Monitoring/Reporting Database	Walt Allen, Monterey
RSTP/CMAQ/TEA Project Delivery Committee	Dan Landon, Nevada
Local Road Rehab Funding & STIP Protection Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Applicability to Rural Counties TEA Advisory Committee	Phil Dow, Lake & Mendocino
Formulas for Distribution of Local Road Funds California Transportation Investment Strategy (CTIS) ITS Applicability to Rural Counties	George Dondero, Calaveras
City/County/Caltrans/FHWA Coordinating Group and Local Assistance "Enhanced Training Committee"	Spencer Clifton, Humboldt
State Planning Guidelines Development Quality Team Clarify/Improve OWP Process Interregional Strategic Transportation Plan (ITSP)	Charles Field, Amador
Local Road Rehab Funding & STIP Protection Federal Aid Project Streamlining Civil Rights Review Title 9 TEA-3 Federal Reauthorization	Celia McAdam, Placer